



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,200	02/03/2006	Johannes J. Van Vaals	2003PO2233WOUS	9601
38107	7590	10/28/2011	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			REARDON, ROCHELLE D	
P. O. Box 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			3777	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com  
debbie.henn@philips.com  
marianne.fox@philips.com

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/567,200	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VAN VAALS, JOHANNES J.
	<b>Examiner</b> ROCHELLE REARDON	<b>Art Unit</b> 3777

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) ROCHELLE REARDON. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.
- (2) Tom Kocovsky. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 October 2011.

Type:  Telephonic  Video Conference  
 Personal [copy given to:  applicant  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed  101  112  102  103  Others

(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 11,21 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Examiner suggested to Applicant, amending independent claims 11 and 22 to include the limitations of dependent claims 23 and 24, respectively. Examiner also suggested including the limitation regarding merging a less distorted region of a first and second magnetic resonance image of allowable claim 2 into the independent claims, and to include these limitations into independent claim 21, as well, to overcome the prior art of record. Applicant said that the suggestions would be taken into consideration and a supplemental amendment would be entered.

**Applicant recordation instructions:** It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

Attachment

/Tse Chen/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3777